ANALECTA ARCHAEOLOGICA RESSOVIENSIA
TOM 3 RZESZÓW 2008

Piotr Berdowski (Rzeszów)

Roman Businesswomen. I: The case of the producers and distributors of garum in Pompeii

This paper is intended to be a beginning of a series of texts about the economic activity of women in Rome. We still do not have a comprehensive monograph referring to the issue; however, one can find a number of contributory papers. During the last three decades, gender studies have been marked by a true explosion of works referring to different aspects of females' life in antiquity and providing invaluable facts. The studies on the economic aspects of females' activity in Greece and Rome have emerged as a relatively new field for researchers against the background of this knowledge. This state is in a way understandable and filling the gaps in our knowledge is a postulate which is urgent and at the same time difficult to complete. The substantial difficulty arises due to the state and character of the sources accessible for scholars. Much has been written about the sparseness of the evidence referring to Greek and Roman women; also it has been underlined that the few sources there are represent the male point of view. As rightly remarked by Neville Morley what we have is not 'the real lives of real ancient women' but rather 'just representation and images of them'[1]. Happily our analytical tools are progressively more and more advanced: the heuristic nature of the present methods does not at all resemble the older works, whose authors had a quite naive attitude to the source material[2].

The nature and the sparseness of the available evidence is one question, the other one concerns the fact that the sources are dispersed. This applies to all kinds of sources: narrative texts (these can be overcome relatively easily), inscriptions, papyri and archaeological objects. The research work consisting in finding texts which mention females may resemble, to some degree, the work of modern historians who

[1] Morley 2004, 90.

[2] See e.g. Donaldson 1907. The works of historians like Sarah Pomeroy, Marilyn Skinner, Jane Gardner, Susan Dixon and many others represent a high academic level. Because of the huge bibliography of gender studies I do not quote their works here. For more about gender historiography referring to the economic activity of women in antiquity see Dixon 2004, 56–74; Berdowski 2007, 283–298.

burrow through the vast collections of the archives. More than once we came across females in the sources *en passant* reading *tituli picti* on amphorae, analyzing business contracts or letters written on papyri from Roman Egypt. Certainly one can meet women more frequently in the epitaphs, but also in this case the inscriptions quite rarely permit us to build a comprehensive picture[3]. In the ensuing situation it is not surprising, that we still do not have a book on the economic activity of women in ancient Rome (it is worth mentioning that the business activity means here more than the production itself). The demand for this kind of book is still valid. In return we have a number of contributory works: either those on the economic activity of females in Roman Egypt[4], or a few papers on the involvement of women in the production of ceramic building materials[5], and textile products[6]. Our knowledge on the legal conditions of the business activities of women is comparatively profound[7].

It seems that the method of small steps in achieving a more general picture of females' involvement in the Roman economy is appropriate and still a great deal is to be done in individual fields. In my paper published in 2007 I formulated the postulate of systematic research on two levels: 'The first, a more shallow level, should relate to the mechanisms of the engagement of females in a given sector of the economy. This postulate can be workable even with reference to those sectors which are characterized by meagre evidence. The second, deeper level, should refer to the detailed research organized around the given problem or region. In cases where the source material is more abundant we have a chance for quantitative findings'[8].

---

[3] We have several source books in English, which include among texts also papyri and inscriptions. However, these books cannot substitute solid research work. Cf. Fantham, Foley, Kampen, Pomeroy, Shapiro 1994; Rowlandson 1998; Evans Grubbs 2002.

[4] Hobson 1983, 311–321; Hobson 1984, 373–390; Pomeroy 1988; Pomeroy 1999; Vandorpe 2002, 324–336 and other text in the volume.

[5] Setälä 1998, 96–110; Setälä 2002, 181–201.

[6] Moeller 1976; Dixon 2001–2002, 7–17.

[7] Gardner 1986; Arjava 1996; Evans Grubbs 2002. We have a paper which throws light on the legal regulations confronted with the daily practice from Puteoli and Pompeii as well. See Gardner 1999, 11–27. Cf. Francis Jones 2006, 118–32.

[8] Berdowski 2007, 294–5. An attempt at the realization of more detailed studies in one particular environment is the book by Lissa Savunen 1997.

* * *

The production and trade in fish salted products in Pompeii constituted a vital element of the Pompeian economy, which is proved by the preserved amphorae and other containers (mostly *urcei* – small slender jars with one handle) in which ready products were transported and sold. Thanks to the *tituli picti*, i.e. painted inscriptions preserved on the jars, one can at least partly reconstruct the structure of the production and trade, and familiarize oneself with the names of the producers and distributors of these products[9]. One can find in this group the names of several females testified in a dozen or so inscriptions, which is not a rich source of material, but it does not prevent us from reaching some preliminary conclusions.

As long as the Pompeian evidence does not deliver the wrong picture, the production and distribution of fish sauces was dominated by *Umbricii*, a Pompeian family with the foremost producer A. Umbricius Scaurus (at least in the last period before the eruption of Vesuvius). Robert I. Curtis calculated that the *tituli picti* connected with Scaurus comprised nearly 30 percent of the total number of the inscriptions mentioning fish sauces in Pompeii. Almost all the *tituli picti* quoting females can be connected with *gens Umbricia*.

Aulus Umbricius Scaurus begun his business activity in the first half of the first century AD and conducted it probably until the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 AD. Not much can be said about Scaurus' origin. His *cognomen* suggests that he was *ingenuus*, though it is not clear if he had links with *Umbricii* from other parts of Italy[10]. Elizabeth Lyding Will thinks that the starting point for the family business of *gens Umbricia* might be the production of transport ceramics. The testimony which might confirm this assumption is the stamp inscription on the amphora of Pompeian origin found in Egypt: A(uli) UMB(ricii)[11]. Lyding Will thinks that with the decline of agriculture in the late Republic *Umbricii* had to diversify their business activity and finally they invested in the production of Arretine ware and, above all, the production of garum

[9] For the fish processing industry in Pompeii see Curtis 1988, 19–49; Curtis 1991, 90–96, 167–69; Étienne, Mayet 1991, 187–94; Étienne, Mayet 1998, 199–215.

[10] Castrén 1975, 232; Curtis 1988, 20–2.

[11] Lyding Will 1984, 9–11. Whether Aulus had business contacts or other links with Lucius Umbricius Scaurus from the region of Arretium, the producer of Arretine ware, is not certain. Cf. *CVArr* 2384–2459.

in Pompeii[12]. A confirmation, as it were, of the mixed economy of the family might be the partly preserved inscription on the *urceus* (Pompeian form VI): ARBOR QUAM | EX RURE SCAURI[13]. If Scaurus did indeed supplemented income from the agricultural sector with garum production we do not know the exact proportion[14].

Scaurus' income must have been considerable: his luxury residence in the old part of the town (*Reg*. VII, xvi 12–15) suggests that this was the case. The house was organized on two levels and had among others three *atria*, perystyl with a small fish pond and private bath[15]. Unique black-and-white mosaics depicting *urcei* were positioned diagonally in four corners of the *impluvium*. The jars had inscriptions like the real *urcei*[16]. The varied content of the inscriptions underlined the wide assortment of Scaurus' products and the terms relating to the quality stressed the high value of the fish sauces. The owner of the house emphasized his personal involvement in the management of the particular workshop (*ex officina Scauri*) as well. The matter is open if Scaurus' name in the genitive following directly the name of the product should be understood explicitly as the name of the producer or a kind of trade mark (see infra)[17].

Nothing suggests that the high economic status of Scaurus was translated into his activity in the field of municipal politics, whereas his son served as aedile and duovir. What is more, he was honored by erecting an equestrian statue in the forum, which was the privilege for a very few people. His funeral was sponsored by the town, which suggests that he died when he held office[18]. We do not know if Scaurus junior was involved in his father's business (judging from the other

[12] Cf. Zaccaria 1989, 477, n. 59; Aubert 1994, 249–50.

[13] Łoś 1996, 124–5. The inscription is quoted after A. Łoś because the publication of C. Giordano and A. Casale 1990, 273–78, was inaccessible for me.

[14] It seems that the connection with agriculture should be seen in the context of the affiliation to the local elites. The profits from the agrarian sector, even if it supplements others, had a serious prestigious significance. For the attitude of the Roman elites to trade and craft see Łoś 1996, *passim*; Berdowski 2004, 259–293.

[15] Curtis 1984, 557–66.

[16] Urceus A: G F SCO[M] | SCAVRI | EX OFFI[CI]|NA SCAV|RI; urceus B: LIQVA | FLOS; urceus C: G F SCOM | SCAVRI; urceus D: LIQVAMEN | OPTIMVM | EX OFFICI[N]|A SCAVRI.

[17] Étienne, Mayet 1991, 187–94; Berdowski 2003, 41–48. Cf. footnote 20.

[18] The statue and the inscription have not survived. However, we know about Scaurus junior's office from the epitaph on his tomb erected by his father. Zob. *CIL* IV 1024; Curtis 1988, 23–7.

examples from Pompeii it is not improbable); however, he certainly benefited from his wealth.

The clear majority of the *tituli picti* connected with Scaurus appear on the local jars defined by Mau and Schoene as *urcei* (Pompeian form VI). The analysis of this material must be preceded with a short introduction. In the last decades one has been able to observe significant progress in ceramic epigraphy, but scholars are not unanimous how to treat the given segments of *tituli picti*. Besides this, it would be a naive belief to think that ancients followed strictly the established rules. For example, the inscriptions on the Spanish amphorae for fish products differ considerably from the similar inscriptions on Pompeian *urcei*. This is also true when we compare other products, e.g. olive-oil, wine etc.

In the *tituli picti* from the Vesuvian towns one can mark off four main elements. Firstly, this is the name of the product with the additional information about fish species and the technological aspects of the production. Secondly, we have the epithets applying to the quality of the product: obviously they had a promotional function. Like in the modern world of advertising, not all the epithets should be treated seriously. They did not always correspond to reality[19]. Thirdly, *tituli picti* contained information about the producers. Fourthly, the names of the distributors of fish sauces were present as well. The delimitation of the production and distribution spheres seems to be an important aspect. Of course hardly ever are all the elements of inscriptions mentioned above found simultaneously. This classification is conventional and in many cases the given elements could overlap each other. For instance, the information about the producer could have promotional aspects for customers as well as those referring explicitly to the quality of product[20].

The name of the producer followed the first two elements of *tituli picti*. When two names in the genitive are mentioned, even if not connected by a conjunction, they refer plausibly to *societas* of producers[21]. Scaurus' name appeared as producer: (*CIL* IV 5682): G(ari) F(los)

[19] For the language of Latin advertisements see Curtis 1984–86, 209–228; Berdowski 2003, 18–55.

[20] The inscription (*CIL* IV 2574b) seems to prove that the name of the producer might have functioned as a trade mark: Gari Flos SC[O]M[BRI] | SCAURI | A. UMBRIC(i) SCAUR(i) | EX OFFICINA SC[AU]RI.

[21] Curtis 1991, 198, n. 6.

SCOMBR(i) | SCAURI, but also as manager of the workshop (*CIL* 2572): G(ari) F(los) PER SE | EX OFFIC(ina) SCAUR(i). Those two functions might be combined in one hand, like in Scaurus' example[22], but usually they were separated. If the preserved evidence renders the actual proportions, Scaurus usually entrusted his freedmen with the management of his *officinae*. This was the case of Umbricius Agathopus and A. Umbricius Abascantus, who operated *officinae* independently but they were employed by their former master[23]. There were many possibilities for the arrangement of business relations: it could be a *locatio conductio operis faciendi* contract, *locatio conductio operarum, locatio conductio rei* or a different type. In the case of Agathopus and Abascantus *locatio conductio operarum* might be concerned, where Scaurus gave the means of the production to his freedmen while *officinatores* offered him their managerial skills.

The presence of women in the production sector of Scaurus' business is not confirmed, but they do appear among the distributors. One of them named Umbricia Fortunata is mentioned in three *tituli picti* on the jars of *urceus* type (the Pompeian form VI): G(ari) F(los) PER SE | AB UMBRICIA FORTUNATA (*CIL* IV 5674 = 2573); [G]AR(UM) CAST(um) | [A]B UMBRICIA FORTUNATA (*CIL* IV 5661) and G(ari) F(los) PER SE | AB UMBRICIA FORTUNATA | VETURINI IULIANI (*CIL* IV 5675). It seems the most probable to treat Fortunata as a distributor, regardless of what the exact understanding of the name of 'distributor' is. The names in the ablative following the preposition *ab* are believed to have referred to wholesalers or retailers (it is not viable to decide definitively at this moment, but it seems to me that the former possibility is more likely)[24]. Umbricia Fortunata was plausibly Scaurus' freedwoman. R. Curtis admits that she might be the Pompeian producer's relative: his wife or sister. This is not totally impossible but the *cognomen* Fortunata, which is considered as *cognomen servile*, shows

[22] We have also an interesting inscription (*CIL* IV 2547a), where Scaurus underlines his double role: G(ari) F(los) SCOMBRI | A. UMBRICI SCAUR(i) EX OFFICINA SCAUR(i).

[23] Umbricius Agathopus: *CIL* IV 5690, 7110, Agathopus: *CIL* IV 2580 (=5691), 9403–5; A. Umbricius Abascantus: *CIL* IV 5689.

[24] Curtis 1991, 199, thinks that 'the ablative case preceded by *ab* identifies the consignor of the vessel. This person could be the producer himself or an employee in the workshop'. But the consignor's definition is not sharp, that is why it is better to assume that we are dealing with a distributor. Cf. Aubert 1994, 268.

her freedwoman background[25]. We do not know to what extent Fortunata was dependent on Scaurus and what legal regulations linked her with her former master. None of the inscriptions connected with Fortunata mentions Scaurus or persons associated with him and it is not proved that she traded Scaurus' sauces. If so, it is unlikely that he had exclusive rights for delivering products to Fortunata.

The third from the group of the quoted inscriptions brought up the name of a Veturinus Iulianus, who is considered by scholars as a recipient of *garum per se*[26]. However, it is not certain because the names of recipients, as we know, stand in the dative. If the name of Veturinus had followed the product's name we would be dealing with a garum producer, but it is preceded by the name of Fortunata in the ablative following the preposition *ab*. R. Curtis thinks that in this case we are dealing with 'the owner of the vessel; that is, a *negotiator* or *navicularius*'[27]. However, it is not clear what would be the part of *negotiator* or *navicularius* (i.e. wholesale sea-trader) in this case. The *titulus pictus* occurs on the *urceus* type of a container, typical of Pompeii and the garum was probably destined for the local market[28]. Perhaps the analogous use of the genitive case may be observed in the inscription on a Pompeian *urceus*, found in Fos-sur-Mer[29]. The authors who published the inscription believe that a L. Marius Ponicus mentioned in it is a 'commerçant exportateur'. They quote the *titulus pictus* with Veturinus Iulianus analyzed above as an analogical example, at the same time excluding the possibility that Iulianus would be the recipient of the garum: 'le nom au génitif ne puisse guère s'interpréter que comme celui d'un «client» de l'atelier dirigé par *Vmbricia Fortunata*, une affranchie de *Scaurus*. Ces noms de clients sont, ailleurs, au datif'[30]. I am inclined to share the view that Iulianus should not be treated as

[25] Duff 1928, 56, 110; Duthoy 1989, 195–196; Łoś 1984, 69.

[26] Étienne, Mayet 1991, 189; Cooley, Cooley 2004, 166. For *garum per se* see Curtis 1991, 164–5; Berdowski 2003, 40.

[27] Curtis 1991, 199.

[28] Two *urcei* of Pompeian type discovered in Fos-sur-Mer on the Mediterranean littoral of France and thanks to the inscriptions connected with Scaurus' garum workshops in Pompeii are not enough proof to think that the Pompeian businessman exported his fish sauces to the provinces. See Liou, Marichal 1978, 165–7, no 69–70.

[29] Liou, Marichal 1978, 165–7, no 69.

[30] Liou, Marichal 1978, 165, n. 129. Cf. Curtis 2005, 41–2: 'Ponicus may be the owner of the *urceus* or the shipper transporting the vessel'.

a recipient, but was he the exporter like the aforementioned Ponicus? I have doubts about this (as a matter of fact in both cases). Iulianus might have been a producer of garum in Pompeii, although he is not attested by other sources. However, we do not know the reason why the name of Iulianus followed the name of the distributor.

It is worth noticing that the trade offer of Umbricia Fortunata included special kinds of fish sauces: *garum per se* and *garum castum*. The former was plausibly garum without any additions, although it is not certain that *garum per se* had this meaning[31]. In turn *garum castum* was a product made according to special criteria, intended for the narrow circle of consumers who practiced some kind of abstinence, e.g. Jews or other groups living in Pompeii[32].

It is possible that also the *titulus pictus CIL* IV 5662: GAR(um) CAST(um) | SCOMBRI [-] FORTUNATI should be connected with Fortunata. It is not definite that the text was correctly read (the doubts are emphasized in *CIL*). In fact this is wider problem and it is associated with the quality of the publication of the *tituli picti* in the fourth volume of *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, which contains the inscriptions from Pompeii. In many cases the reading was not careful enough and the comparison with the jars themselves is not possible today. The kind of the product i.e. *garum castum* seems to weigh in favor of Fortunata. It looks as if she specialized in selling 'kosher' garum in Pompeii (in the case of *CIL* IV 5662 she would appear as garum producer). The *tituli picti* which recorded the names of *garum castum* and *muria casta* are not numerous[33]. Conversely, if the said inscription should be linked to a Fortunatus, he was likely a producer of *garum castum*. Strictly speaking we do not know anything about Fortunatus, also if he had any connection with Fortunata.

The next female attested in Pompeian *tituli picti* is Umbricia. She appears in 9 inscriptions, mostly on Pompeian *urcei*[34]. Because only her *nomen gentile* is mentioned it is not completely certain if she is a distinct person from Umbricia Fortunata. Personally, I am in favor

---

[31] Cf. n. 26.

[32] Corcoran 1958, 69; Curtis 1991, 165–166; Berdowski 2003, 37–8. In reality, the majority of fish sauces in Pompeii met the requirements of kosherness because they were made of mackerel (*scomber*). Cf. Berdowski 2008, 239–57.

[33] *Garum castum*: *CIL* IV 2569, 2611(?), 5660, 5661 (Umbricia Fortunata), 5662 (Fortunatus /a ?); *muria casta*: IV 2609.

[34] *CIL* IV 2623 (=5696), 5670, 5688, 5697, 5710 (=2594), 5723, 10262, 10281.

of thinking of them as separate persons. The lack of *cognomen* should be treated as an intentional decision[35]. It is worth reminding ourselves here how the nomenclature of female's names functioned in the late Republic and early Principate.

In the periods of the kings and the early Republic, women had *praenomina*, which disappeared in the third century BC and *gentilicium* started to be used instead, at the same time. In theory, each female had one official name. However, from the practical point of view, this situation was not convenient when there were more daughters in one family. They received additional unofficial nicknames, based usually on the birth order of girls (e.g. Prima, Secunda, Maior, Minor etc.). The nicknames disappeared in the early Principate when female *cognomina* became commonly used. In literary sources of the late Republic there was a rule of mentioning females by one name (*nomen gentilicium*) even if they had *cognomina.* Whereas in inscriptions females were addressed in many different ways, including filiation. In the mid-first century AD the custom of addressing women by *cognomina* (if they had them) had become quite common. In other cases they were addressed by *gentilicium*[36]. The *cognomen* was an even more important part of the freedmen and freedwomen's nomenclature. It was formed from the slave's name (usually Greek, although Latin names are attested as well). It is considered that the omission of the *cognomina* by freedmen was very rare[37].

It is hard to believe that Scaurus' freedwoman hid her *cognomen*. Thus it is more probable that Umbricia was a free-born female. It is worth stressing that the *cognomina* of all freedmen and freedwomen of Scaurus known to us are consistently present in the *tituli picti*: already discussed Umbricius Abascatus, Umbricius Agathopus and Umbricia Fortunata, as well as Umbricia Antiochis and Umbricia Ianuaria recorded in the tablets of the well-known Pompeian banker L. Caecilius Iucundus[38]. Everything indicates that Umbricia was a free-born woman, a member of *gens Umbricia*. It is possible that she was Scaurus' wife,

[35] It might be that in two cases (*CIL* IV 5696, 5710), because of the erased text after Umbricia's *nomen gentile*, a potential *cognomen* of Umbricia Fortunata or other Umbricia was mentioned.

[36] Kajava 1995, 19–31; Dickey 2002, 73–6.

[37] Treggiari 1969, 250–1; Łoś 1984, 65–70.

[38] Cf. footnote 42.

sister or even daughter. Even if Umbricia had a *cognomen*, as a free and recognizable person in Pompeii, she could resign from its use[39].

The assortment of the products offered by Umbricia was wide and included garum (*CIL* IV 5670), muria (*CIL* IV 5723), liquamen (*CIL* IV 5710 [=2594], 10281) and hallex (*CIL* IV 10262), which means that she had been selling all kinds of Roman fish sauces. Only one jar preserved the name of Scaurus as a producer. It seems that, similarly to Umbricia Fortunata, Umbricia sold also the fish sauces coming from other producers. One *titulus pictus* with the name of Umbricia occurs on the neck of an amphora (*CIL* IV 5723) which was probably not Italian origin. Unfortunately, one cannot find the exact description of the amphora in *CIL*. The example of the other amphora found in Pompeii with the name of *navicularius* M. Valerius Euphemus and the name of Scaurus in the genitive suggests that the Pompeian businessman imported salted fish products to Pompeii. In this case it is clear that the amphora came from Spain[40]. The Spanish fish sauces imported to Pompeii constituted probably luxurious products destined for a narrow clientele. Umbricia might have expanded her offer by Spanish imports as well. We do not know the business relations between Umbricia and Scaurus. If she remained *in manu* of Scaurus because of their family relation, she worked for Scaurus without any additional legal regulation.

The next female who distributed fish sauces in Pompeii was Eutyches. One urceus bears *titulus pictus* with her name (*CIL* 2576): G(ari) F(los) SCOMBR(i) | SCAURI | AB EUTYCHE SCAURI. Eutyches was a slave of Scaurus and sold garum for her master. Unfortunately, we know nothing about Etyches herself and her business activity. As a slave she was under Scaurus' *potestas* and the contract in this case was not necessary[41]. Even so she was pretty independent in her activity.

R. Curtis admits that the other two Scaurus' freedwomen who are attested in wax-tablets of the well-known Pompeian banker C. Caecilius Secundus might be connected with the fish business. These were Umbricia Ianuaria and Umbricia Antiochis (*CIL* IV Suppl. 1, XXI-

[39] Next Scaurus hardly ever appears in the *tituli picti* with *tria nomina*. Certainly he was easily recognizable in Pompeii because of his business and magnificent residence.

[40] Manacorda 1977, 131.

[41] See Aubert 1994, 9–10.

II–XXIV, XXV)[42]. Nothing contradicts this assumption, but nothing proves it at the same time[43].

The next woman whose name appears on a jar which contained fish sauce is Caesia Helpis. She was a member of the known Pompeian family involved in the production and trade of wine[44]. *Vinum Caesianum*, attested in the reign of Emperor Nero, was probably a kind of wine designed for the local market, but the assortment of wines produced and distributed by *Caesii* was certainly wider and plausibly included imported wines. Caesia Helpis appears as an independent producer of wine in the inscriptions *CIL* IV, 5789–91, 5793, whereas it is not certain if she distributed her products. It looks as if one of Caesia's distributors was a Vibia, whose name in the ablative following the preposition *ab* appears on the amphora Schoene-Mau IX type. The identification of Caesia is based on the initials CH. The reading of this abbreviation as C(aesia) H(elpis) is probable, as the jar was found along with other amphorae with the name of Caesia. I will return to Vibia later, because she was possibly a producer of fish sauces as well.

The connection of Caesia Helpis with wine production raises no doubts; however, the open question is if she was at the same time a garum producer, which is suggested by the contents of the inscription on the container found in the *House of the Ship Europa* (*Reg* I. xv 3): GARUM | SCOMBRI | PRIMUM | M. ACCEI TELEMACHI | CAESIAE HELPIDIS[45]. Two names in the genitive following the name of the product, although not linked by the conjunction *et*, refer to the producers of garum. The lack of the conjunction is not an obstacle to acknowledge M. Acceius Telemachus and Caesia Helpis as members of *societas* who produced garum. Combining the activity in different fields of food production was not exceptional. Unfortunately, the fig-

[42] Curtis 1988, 32: 'Jucundus' records a date no later than A.D. 62, so it is possible that both could have engaged in the fish sauce business during this period but had ceased to do so by the late 70s. Since the *tituli* would probably all date to the latter period, this would account for the absence of their names on any fish sauce vessel found at Pompeii'.

[43] For Umbricia Ianuaria nad Umbricia Antiochis see Savunen 1997, 72–77; Gardner 1999, 23–6; Cooley, Cooley 2004, 186–7; Francis Jones 2006, 130–2. For more about Iucundus' activity see Andreau 1974.

[44] *Caesii* are attested early in the epigraphic material. L. Caesius, a member of the family served as duovir soon after the colony had been established by Sulla (*CIL* X 819).

[45] Curtis 1991, 198–9, n. 6.

ure of Telemachus is not attested in other inscriptions. It is likely that he was a freedman connected with *gens Accea*. However, one can attempt to establish the social status of Caesia.

Andrzej Łoś thinks that Caesia Helpis was freedwoman connected with *gens Ceasia*. She might have been involved in 'large sea trade as an agent of a wealthier person'[46]. However, it seems a premature statement. Based on the inscriptions we have at our disposal at the moment, Caesia should be seen first of all as a wine producer[47].

It would be interesting to capture the potential link between Caesia and a C. Caesius Restitus, whom we consider as a wine retailer in Pompeii. In 1967 Wilhelmina Jashemski published her paper in which she analyzed archaeological finds of amphorae from the house in *Reg*. ix 6-7, which gained the name of *Casa del Vinaio*[48]. In the comparatively modest house 111 amphorae were found, among them at least 60 bearing *tituli picti*. The majority of the amphorae served as wine containers for both Pompeian and imported wines. A few jars (amphorae and *urcei*) contained olive oil and fish sauces. Beyond all doubt the owner of the house was a wine distributor. The number of amphorae, the assortment of wines and usage of the garden for commercial purposes (it served as a store-house), eliminate the possibility that wine was stocked up for the household members, whereas the olive oil and fish sauces might have been both the objects of trade and consumption items. Thanks to *titulus pictus* on the amphora of Pompeian type IX (*CIL* IV 5794), the owner of the *Casa del Vinaio* is thought to be C. Caesius Restitus[49]. The point is that the name of Restitutus is in the dative. This requires us to think that the dative case was not 'reserved' for the recipient of the product, but also, as Curtis postulates, 'the intermediary owner' or if the name was written in a different color 'the consumer or the shopkeeper'. From the description in *CIL* it appears that the whole inscription was painted in red. It is worth stressing that our knowledge about the names in *tituli picti* in the dative case is barely organized and systematical studies including all kinds of amphorae are needed. If the identification of Restitutus is correct, we are dealing

[46] Łoś 1991, 118–9.

[47] The connection of Caesia with *Casa del Maiale* (IX 9 b-c), which was postulated by M. Della Corte, and quoted by Łoś, is not proven. See Della Corte 1965, 51, 137; Łoś 1991, 118.

[48] Jashemski 1967, 193–204.

[49] Della Corte 1965, 137–8; Jashemski 1967, 194; Łoś 1991, 119.

with a freedman who worked as *institor* for *gens Caesia*. The modest character of the house contrasts with the scale of the business enterprise, which – according to Łoś – suggests that the business activity of the *vinarius* was sponsored by a wealthier patron[50]. The question naturally arises whether Caesia Helpis cooperated with C. Caesius Restitutus. A. Łoś underlines the proximity of *Casa del Vinaio* and *Casa del Maiale*, where Caesia Helpis allegedly lived. Except that the connection of Restitus with *Casa del Vinaio* is not indisputable, not to mention that Della Corte's arguments indicating the link between Caesia Helpis and *Casa del Maiale* are weak[51]. There are too many speculations here and too many conditional statements.

We are on more firm ground when tracing the link between Caesia Helpis and the aforementioned Vibia. The inscription (*CIL* IV 5792) mentioned earlier suggests that Vibia was a distributor of Caesia's wine. Is it the same Vibia who occurs in the *titulus pictus*: HALLEX | OPTIMA | VIBIAE (*CIL* IV 9411)? Obviously it is not possible to decide unequivocally if the name of Vibia stands in the genitive or dative case. In the former case she should be treated as a producer of hallex, in the latter she would be – using Curtis' terminology – the intermediary owner or shopkeeper[52]. Liisa Savunen thinks that 'it could be that Vibia and Caesia Helpis were engaged in some sort of co-operation. … *CIL* 5792 [Savunen refers to 5722 but I suspect that this is typographical error] may refer to Vibia as a wine-producer and Caesia as a wine merchant…'[53]. Indeed, one cannot exclude that beyond the trade activity, Vibia was also a producer of wine and garum[54]. In contrast, nothing suggests that trade was Caesia's domain. The social status of Vibia remains obscure. Undoubtedly, she was not a slave. Should she be counted among *ingenui* or *libertini*? This is only speculation. Too scanty source material is available to us to link Vibia with other members of *gens Vibia*[55].

---

[50] Łoś 1991, 119.

[51] Cf. Della Corte 1965, 165.

[52] Cf. Curtis 1991, 199.

[53] Savunen 1997, 87 and note 30.

[54] Cf. *vinum Vibianum* (*CIL* IV 9331). One more inscription might be associated with Vibia (*CIL* IV 5713): LIQUAMEN | OPTIMUM | AB VIBU... Fortunately, the reproduction of the inscription is printed in *CIL* which enables our own inspection. It seems to me that the reading: AB UMBRI[CIA] is more probable.

[55] For *gens Vibia* see. Castrén 1975, 240–1, no. 457.

The names of women are present also on jars the contents of which were not described. It might be concluded only on the basis of the typology of the jars. Liisa Savunen enumerates in this group a Secunda, whose name is present on *urceus*[56]. In this case there is a strong chance that we are dealing with an inhabitant of Pompeii, but we do not know if she was a producer or a recipient of fish sauce. It is not entirely clear if the *urceus* was filled with fish sauce and if the *titulus pictus* should be related to garum or another fish sauce. The point is that the jar might have been used for a second time containing a different product. Elizabeth Lyding Will suggests that the jars were described only when they were used for the second time: 'Dipinti naming contents, then, generally tell us what the Romans stored in their amphoras after the original, imported contents had been used'[57]. The names of females on the amphorae of Spanish origin are even more dubious and Savunen rightly rules out that there are among them the producers of fish sauces[58]. For the reason that they cannot be connected with Pompeii the recognition of them as recipients is also premature. I am not convinced by the attempt to think about Terentia mentioned in the inscription *CIL* IV 9609 as a Pompeian recipient as well[59].

* * *

As was said at the beginning of the paper the source material referring to the economic activity of women in Pompeii is relatively scanty.

[56] Savunen 1997, 87–88. Cf. *CIL* IV 5877: N POM [-] | [SE]CUNDAE.

[57] Lyding Will 2001, 263. Lyding Will's generalization goes too far I think. The examples quoted by her rather induce to caution in arguments based on the preserved *tituli picti* (*dipinti*), than prove the hypothesis of the general rule of describing transport containers' second time use.

[58] Savunen 1997, 88.

[59] Certainly it is not *conditum vinum Pompeianum*, but *cordula*, that is salted tuna. The inscriptions with *cordula* are typical for Spanish and Mauretanian amphorae in which salsamenta were imported; it is difficult to explain why the text *cordula Pompeiana* would be found there. It would be one known example of *cordula Pompeiana*, whereas we do have CO(r)D(ula) PO[-] (*CIL* XV 4732; Liou 1987, 69, no. F 98), which might suggest that the letter M in *CIL* IV 9609 was not read correctly. The uncertainty comes from the quality of the publication of the inscriptions in *CIL* IV and the errors. These doubts seem to be agreed by Liou 1987, 69, note 28. Cf. Callender 1965, 37; Manacorda 1977, 127. It is not clear if this is the same Teraentia who is known from *CIL* IV 9373d. Even more doubts are raised in the cases of Varia Potita, Naevoleia and Gavia Severa. See Savunen, 1997, 88–9.

However, it seems that based on the discussion presented above some conclusions can be proposed.

The women engaged in the production and distribution of fish sauce in Pompeii are distinguished by lower social status. First of all, in this group there were freedwomen and one slave. As a matter of fact only Umbricia can be thought as a freeborn woman (as long as the assumption that she was Scaurus' relative – probably wife or daughter – is correct). Possibly Vibia was *ingenua* as well, but this is only speculation. It looks as if a similar social pattern may be observed among men involved in the garum business. This general tendency can be associated with the fact that the production and trade of fish sauces were close to Cicero's definition of *mercatura sordida.* Clearly it was not a serious burden for Scaurus and his wife. Was it for their son who sought local offices in Pompeii? Perhaps to some degree yes, but the financial support of his father eliminated this inconvenience.

It is striking that the economic activity of women is connected primarily with the distribution aspect. As a matter of fact, only about Caesia Helpis can one say that she was a producer of garum. Perhaps Vibia should be added to the list as well. Of course the absence of females in the sphere of production might be the preserved source effect. However it is significant that women appear in the *tituli picti* as *officinatrices*, whereas Scaurus' freedmen: A. Umbricius Abascantus and Umbricius Agathopus acted both as *officinatores* and distributors[60].

Despite this difference, it does not seem that women were in any way underprivileged compared to men who held the same economic and social position. The assortment of the products sold by females was not smaller than the one offered by men (quite the opposite: e.g. Umbricia distributed garum, liquamen, muria as well as hallex). Women offered Pompeian products and Spanish imports as well. The methods of advertising were the same. Females, similarly to men, formed *societates*: they cooperated both with men and women (e.g. Caesia Helpis with M. Acceius Telemachus, or with Vibia). We have examples of enterprises where the production and trade of different products complemented each other, e.g. garum and wine.

[60] A. Umbricius Abascantus: CIL IV 5689 (as *officinator*), IV 5685, 5671, 5724 (as distributor); Umbricius Agathopus: *CIL* IV 5690, 7110 (as *officinator*), IV 5712, 9394, 9418–9, 9621 (as distributor).

It seems that a clear majority of females (or perhaps all of those we know), although running their business quite independently, worked for their patrons. It is obvious in the case of Etyches, who was Scaurus' slave, but also Scaurus' freedwoman Umbricia Fortunata, formally independent (if *obsequium* towards the patron was not too burdensome – we know nothing about it), might have made use of Scaurus' financial support. Similarly Caesia Helpis might be associated with *gens Caesia*. Umbricia also acted within the family 'corporation', surely according to Scaurus' will.

Unfortunately we cannot link a given female with the individual house. The connection of Caesia Helpis with the *Casa del Maiale* is, putting it mildly, loose. Next one can guess that Umbricia lived in Scaurus' residence in *Reg.* VII, xvi 12–15. However, this is only an assumption because nothing arises from the sources.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the picture outlined here cannot be seen in a static way. Despite the common belief that the inscriptions on the jars found in Pompeii derived from the relatively short period before the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 AD (probably several years), we should not give in to the temptation of the photographic reproduction of the social conditions in one particular temporal point. Single inscriptions which are several dozen years older than the destruction of the city encourage caution. Even among those inscriptions analyzed above one can trace different phases of Scaurus' economic activity. E.g. Umbricius Agathopus is once addressed in *tituli picti* by his *cognomen* only, and another time by *nomen gentile* + *cognomen*. One can interpret this in the way that originally Agathopus operated *officina* as Scaurus' slave. After Agathopus' manumission his economic relations towards his former master did not die out and he ran his business for Scaurus or in cooperation with him. From this point he described the jars giving both his *gentilicium* and *cognomen*. This is one simple example, but more might be quoted.

The example of Pompeii shows that the involvement of females in the business world was not a caprice of singular women. Of course this world was dominated by men, but females constituted a noticeable percentage in it. The economic independence of women, strengthened in the early years of the Principate by Augustus' legislation, was a fact in the first century AD and at the same time part of the wider transformation of Roman family and society.

References

Andreau J. 1974. *Les affaires de Monsieur Jucundus* (= *Collection de l'École française de Rome* 19). Rome.

Arjava A. 1996. *Women and Law in Late Antiquity*. Oxford.

Aubert J.-J. 1994. *Business Managers in Ancient Rome: A Social and Economic Study of Institores, 200 B.C. – A.D. 250* (= *Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition* 21). Leiden.

Berdowski P. 2003. *Tituli picti* und die antike Werbesprache für Fischprodukte, *Münstersche Beiträge z. antiken Handelsgeschichte* 22 (2), 18–54.

Berdowski P. 2004. Gospodarka i ideologia – stosunek rzymskich elit do rzemiosła (I w. p.n.e. – I w. n.e.) [Economy and Ideology – the Attitude of Roman Elites towards Craft]. In L. Morawiecki and P. Berdowski (eds.), *Ideologia i propaganda w starożytności. Materiały konferencji Komisji Historii Starożytnej PTH, Rzeszów, 12–14 września 2000*. Rzeszów, 259–293.

Berdowski P. 2007. Some remarks on the economic activity of women in the Roman Empire: a research problem. In P. Berdowski and B. Blahaczek (eds.), *Haec mihi in animis vestris templa. Studia Classica in Memory of Professor Lesław Morawiecki,* Rzeszów, 283–298.

Berdowski P. 2008. Garum of Herod the Great (Latin-Greek Inscription on the Amphora from Masada). *The Qumran Chronicle* 16, 107–122.

Callender M. H. 1965. *Roman amphorae with index of stamps*. London.

Castrén P. 1975. *Ordo Populusque Pompeianus. Polity and society in Roman Pompeii*. Roma.

Cooley A. E., Cooley M. G. L. 2004. *Pompeii. A sourcebook*. London.

Corcoran T. 1958. Garum Castimoniarum. *The Classical Bulletin* 34, 69.

Curtis R. I. 1984. A Personalized Floor Mosaic from Pompeii. *American Journal of Archaeology* 88, 557–66.

Curtis R. I. 1984–86. Product identification and advertising on Roman commercial amphorae. *Ancient Society* 15–17, 209–228.

Curtis R. I. 1988. A. Umbricius Scaurus of Pompeii. In R. I. Curtis (ed.), *Studia Pompeiana et Classica in Honour of W. F. Jashemski* 1. New Rochelle, 19–49.

Curtis R. I. 1991. *Garum and salsamenta. Production and Commerce in materia medica* (= *Studies in Ancient Medicine* 3). Leiden.

Curtis R. I. 2005. Sources for Production and Trade of Greek and Roman Processed Fish. In T. Bekker-Nielsen (ed.), *Ancient Fishing and Fish Processing in the Black Sea Region* (= *Black Sea Studies* 2). Aarhus, 31–46.

Della Corte M. 1965. *Case ed abitanti di Pompei*, 3a edizione a cura di P. Soprano, Napoli.

Dickey E. 2002. *Latin Forms of Address: From Plautus to Apuleius*. Oxford.

Dixon S. 2001–2002. How do you count them if they're not there? New perspectives on Roman cloth production. *Opuscula Romana* 25–26, 7–17.

Dixon S. 2004. Exemplary housewife or luxurious slut? Cultural representations of women in the Roman economy. In F. McHardy, E. Marshall (eds.), *Women's influence on classic civilization*. London, 56–74.

Donaldson J. 1907. *Woman. Her position and influence in ancient Greece and Rome, and among the early Christians*. New York.

Duff A. 1928. *Freedmen in the early Roman empire*. Oxford.

Duthoy R. 1989.Cognomen est omen? Quelques jalons pour une anthroponymie sociale du monde romain. *Mélanges P. Léveque* 2, 195–196.

Étienne R. and Mayet F. 1991. Le Garum a la mode Scaurus, In J. M. Blazquez, S. Montero (eds.), *Alimenta. Estudios en homenaje al Dr Michael Ponsich*. Madrid, 187–94.

Étienne R. and Mayet F. 1998. Le garum a Pompéi. Production et commerce. *Revue des Études Anciennes* 100, 199–215.

Evans Grubbs J. 2002. *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A sourcebook on marriage, divorce and widowhood*. London.

Fantham E., Foley H., Kampen N., Pomeroy S. and Shapiro H. 1994. *Women in the Classical World. Image and text*. New York.

Francis Jones D. 2006. *The Bankers of Puteoli: Finance, Trade and Industry in the Roman World*. Tempus.

Gardner J. F. 1986. *Women in Roman law & society*. London.

Gardner J. F. 1999. Women in Business Life: Some Evidence from Puteoli. In P. Setälä and L. Savunen (eds.), *Female networks and the public sphere in Roman society* (*Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae* 22). Rome, 11–27.

Giordano C. and Casale A. 1990. Iscrizioni pompeiane inedite scoperte tra gli anni 1954–1978. *Atti dell'Academia Pontaniana* 39, 273–378.

Hobson D. 1983. Women as Property Owners in Roman Egypt. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 113, 311–321.

Hobson D. 1984. The Role of Women in the Economic Life of Roman Egypt: A Case Study from First Century Tebtynis. *Echos du Monde Classique/ Classical Views* 28, 373–390.

Jashemski W. 1967. A Pompeian Vinarius. *Classical Journal* 62, 193–204.

Kajava M. 1995. *Roman Female Praenomina. Studies in the Nomenclature of Roman Women*. Helsinki.

Liou B. 1987. Inscriptions peintes sur amphores: Fos (suite), Marseille, Toulon, Port-la-Nautique, Arles, Saint- Blaise, Saint-Martin-de-Crau, Mâcon, Calvi. *Archaeonautica* 7, 65–138.

Liou B. and Marichal R. 1978. Les inscriptions peintes sur amphores de l'anse Saint-Gervais a Fos-sur-Mer. *Archaeonautica* 2, 109–181.

Łoś A. 1984. Wolno urodzeni i wyzwoleńcy w Pompejach (studium onomastyczne epitafiów) [Freeborn men and freedmen in Pompei (an onomastic study of the epitaphs)]. *Antiquitas* 12 (*Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis No.* 722), 47–85.

Łoś A. 1991. *Wyzwoleńcy w Pompejach. Studium stosunków ekonomicznych w kampańskim mieście* [Freedmen in Pompeii. A socio-economic study] (*Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis No.* 1129). Wrocław.

Łoś A. 1996. *„Dobrze urodzenie" i „dorobkiewicze". Studium socjologiczne elit miast kampańskich od Augusta do Domicjana* ['Well-borns' and 'parvenu'. A sociological study of the elites in Campanian towns from Augustus to Domitianus]. Wrocław.

Lyding Will E. 1984. Ähnlichkeiten zwischen Stempeln auf Amphoren und auf arretinischen Gefässen. In *Studien zur römischen Keramik: Vorträge des 13. Internationalen Kongresses der Rei Cretariae Romanae Fautores in München. Rei Cretariae Romanae Fautorum Acta* 23–24 (1984), 9–11.

Lyding Will E. 2001. Truth in Roman Labelling? *American Journal of Archaeology* 105, 263.

Manacorda D. 1977. Anfore spagnole a Pompei. In *L'instrumentum domesticum di Ercolano e Pompei nella prima età imperiale. Atti del II incontro di studio, Napoli, 30 maggio- 3 giugno 1973*. Roma, 121–133.

Moeller W. 1976. *The wool trade in ancient Pompeii* (*Studies of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 3). Leiden.

Morley N. 2004. *Theories, Models and Concepts in Ancient History*. London.

Pomeroy S. B. 1988. Women in Roman Egypt. A Preliminary Study based on Papyri. In *ANRW* II 10.1, Berlin, 708–723. = H. Foley (ed.), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*. London 1981, 303–22.

Rowlandson J. (ed.) 1998.*Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt: A Sourcebook*. Cambridge.

Rowlandson J. 1999. *Women in Hellenistic Egypt. From Alexander to Cleopatra*. Detroit.

Savunen L. 1997.*Women in the urban texture of Pompeii*. Helsinki.

Setälä P. 1998. Female property and power in imperial Rome. In L. Larsson Lovén and A. Strömberg (eds.), *Aspects of women in antiquity. Proceedings of the First Nordic Symposium on Women's Lives in Antiquity. Göteborg 12–15 June 1997*. Jonsered, 96–110.

Setälä P. 2002. Women and Brick Production – Some New Aspects. In P. Setälä *et al.* (eds.), *Women, wealth and power in the Roman Empire* (*Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae* 25). Rome, 181–201.

Treggiari S. 1969. *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*. Oxford.

Vandorpe K. 2002. Apollonia, a Businesswoman in a Multicultural Society (Pathyris, 2nd–1st Cent. B.C.). In H. Melaerts, L. Mooren (eds.), *Le rôle et le statut de la femme en Égypte hellénistique, romaine et byzantine. Actes du colloque international, Bruxelles – Leuven 27–29 novembre 1997* (*Studia Hellenistica* 37). Peeters, 324–336.

Zaccaria C. 1989. Per una prosopografia dei personaggi menzionati sui bolli delle anfore romane dell'Italia nordorientale. In *Amphores romaines et histoire économique: dix ans de recherche. Actes du colloque de Siene (22–24 mai 1986)* (*Coll. de l'École Française de Rome* 114). Rome, 469–484.

Piotr Berdowski (Rzeszów)

Rzymskie businesswomen I: Przykład producentek i dystrybutorek garum w Pompejach

Niniejszy artykuł stanowi w zamierzeniu początek serii tekstów o zaangażowaniu ekonomicznym kobiet w Rzymie. Problem ten nie doczekał się kompleksowego opracowania, choć sporo można by zebrać prac drobnych o charakterze przyczynkarskim. Studia „genderowe", które w trakcie trzech ostatnich dekad zaznaczyły się wręcz eksplozją publikacji o różnych przejawach życia kobiet w starożytności, dostarczyły nam bezcennej wiedzy. Na tym tle studia nad ekonomiczną działalnością kobiet w Grecji i Rzymie rysują się raczej skromnie. Taki stan rzeczy jest w pewnym sensie zrozumiały, a wypełnienie zaistniałej luki jawi się jako postulat, tyleż ważny, co trudny w realizacji. Podstawowa trudność wynika ze stanu i charakteru dostępnych źródeł. Wiele już napisano na temat skromnej bazy źródłowej dotyczącej greckich i rzymskich kobiet; podkreślano też, że te nieliczne świadectwa, którymi dysponujemy prezentują męską optykę. Mimo tych trudności, metoda małych kroków w dochodzeniu do bardziej całościowych obrazów powinna zaowocować w przyszłości wypełnieniem wielu białych plam w badaniach nad aktywnością ekonomiczną rzymskich kobiet.

Produkcja i handel garum i innymi przetworami rybnymi stanowiła istotny element pompejańskiej gospodarki. Świadczą o tym przede wszystkim zachowane amfory i inne naczynia (przede wszystkim urcei – niewielkie naczynia z jednym imadłem) w których transportowano i sprzedawano gotowe wyroby. Dzięki malowanym napisom (tzw. *tituli picti*), zachowanym na naczyniach, możemy odtworzyć przynajmniej w części strukturę produkcji i handlu, poznać imiona producentów i dystrybutorów tych produktów. W grupie tej znajdziemy imiona kilku kobiet poświadczonych w kilkunastu inskrypcjach, co, choć stanowi skromną bazę źródłową, nie pozbawia nas możliwości wyciągnięcia na podstawie tych danych pewnych wniosków.

Większość pompejańskiej produkcji garum była zdominowana przez A. Umbriciusa Scaurusa i osoby z nim powiązane. W grupie tej występuje Umbricia Fortunata, poświadczona w trzech *tituli picti* na naczyniach typu *urceus* (Pompeian form VI) (*CIL* IV 5674 = 2573, IV 5661, IV 5675). Była ona dystrybutorką garum i prawdopodobnie wyzwolenicą Scaurusa. Dziewięć inskrypcji (*CIL* IV 2623 (= 5696), 5670, 5688, 5697, 5710 (= 2594), 5723, 10262, 10281) wymienia też Umbricię (obecne jest wyłącznie *nomen gentile*), która, w moim przekonaniu, jest inną osobą niż Umbricia Fortunata. Brak cognomen sugeruje, że mamy do czynienia z kobietą wolną, członkinią *gens Umbricia*. W ofercie handlowej Umbricii znajdujemy szeroki asortyment

sosów rybnych, produkowanych nie tylko w warsztatach kontrolowanych przez Scaurusa, ale również innych producentów garum w Pompejach. Nie wiemy jakie były relacje biznesowe Umbricii ze Scaurusem. Jeśli ze względu na relacje rodzinne pozostawała *in manu* Scaurusa, prowadziła działalność na jego konto.

Ze Scaurusem była związana również kolejna kobieta handlująca sosami rybnymi w Pompejach, a mianowicie Eutyches. Jej imię występuje tylko w jednym *titulus pictus* na urceus (*CIL* 2576). Eutyches była niewolnicą Scaurusa, która handlowała garum swojego pana. Zapewne wykonywała ściśle powierzone jej przez Scaurusa zadania, choć biznesem kierowała samodzielnie. Z produkcją sosów rybnych związana byłą również Vibia (*CIL* IV 9411). Z pewnością nie była niewolnicą. Czy należy ją jednak zaliczyć do *ingenuae*, czy *libertinae*, pozostaje w sferze domysłów. Zbyt szczupłym materiałem źródłowym dysponujemy aby powiązać Vibię z innymi członkami *gens Vibia*. Być może do grupy producentów garum należy też zaliczyć Caesia Helpis, która ponad wszelką wątpliwość byłą również producentką wina w Pompejach.

Kobiety o których wiemy, że produkowały bądź handlowały sosami rybnymi w Pompejach charakteryzują się niskim statusem społecznym. Są to przede wszystkim wyzwolenice (jak również jedna niewolnica). Właściwie za wolno urodzoną możemy uznać tylko Umbricię, o ile założenie, że była ona bliską krewną (najpewniej żoną, bądź córką) Scaurusa jest słuszne. Być może *ingenua* była również Vibia, ale są to wyłącznie domysły. Wygląda na to, że podobnie układały się proporcje wyzwoleńców i *ingenui* wśród mężczyzn. Ta ogólna tendencja może mieć związek z tym, że działalność biznesowa związana z wytwórstwem i dystrybucją sosów rybnych bliska była cycerońskiej definicji *mercatura sordida.*

Jest uderzające, że działalność ekonomiczna kobiet jest związana ze sferą dystrybucji sosów rybnych. Właściwie tylko o Caesia Helpis możemy z pewnością powiedzieć, że była producentką garum, być może należałoby tu dodać jeszcze nazwisko Vibii. Oczywiście zbyt szczupłym materiałem źródłowym dysponujemy i nieobecność kobiet w sferze produkcyjnej może być dziełem przypadku. Jest jednak znamienne, że kobiety nie figurują w *tituli picti* w funkcji *officinatrices*, podczas gdy np. wyzwoleńcy Scaurusa: A. Umbricius Abascantus i Umbricius Agathopus występują zarówno jako *officinatores*, jak i dystrybutorzy.

Mimo tej różnicy, nie wydaje się aby kobiety były w jakikolwiek sposób upośledzone w stosunku do mężczyzn trudniących się tym samym zajęciem. Asortyment produktów sprzedawanych przez kobiety nie był uboższy od tego, oferowanego przez mężczyzn (wręcz przeciwnie, był nawet bogatszy; np. Umbricia handlowała zarówno garum, liquamen, muria, jak i hallex). Kobiety handlowały zarówno produktami pompejańskimi, jak i importowały sosy hiszpańskie. Sposób reklamowania produktów był standardowy. Kobiety, podobnie jak mężczyźni tworzyły *societates*, współpracowały zarówno z mężczyznami, jak i kobietami (np. Caesia Helpis z M. Acceiusem

Telemachem, czy z Vibią). Mamy też przykłady łączenia produkcji i handlu różnymi produktami.

Wydaje się, że zdecydowana większość kobiet (a być może nawet wszystkie potwierdzone), jakkolwiek samodzielnie prowadziły biznes, pracowały na rzecz swojego patrona. Jest to oczywiste w przypadku Eutyches, która była niewolnicą Scaurusa, ale i Umbricia Fortunata, wyzwolenica Scaurusa, mimo, że formalnie samodzielna (o ile obsequium w stosunku do patrona nie było zbyt uciążliwe, ale o tym nic nie wiemy), mogła wciąż korzystać ze wsparcia kapitałowego Scaurusa, za czym oczywiście szło przekazywanie odpowiedniej ilości dochodów dawnemu panu. Podobnie Caesia Helpis mogła być związana z *gens Caesia*. Również Umbricia działała w ramach rodzinnej „korporacji", z pewności w zgodzie z wolą Scaurusa.

Niestety, nie potrafimy powiązać kobiet z poszczególnymi domami. Związek Caesia Helpis z *Casa del Maiale* jest, mówiąc delikatnie, luźny. Z kolei, możemy się domyślać, że Umbricia zamieszkiwała rezydencję Scaurusa w Reg. VII, xvi 12–15. Są to jednak przypuszczenia i nic pewnego w tym zakresie nie wynika ze źródeł.

Warto na koniec poczynić jeszcze jedną uwagę, która ma wymiar bardziej ogólny. Otóż zarysowany tutaj obraz nie powinien być traktowany statycznie. Mimo, że istnieje powszechne przekonanie, że zachowane w Pompejach inskrypcje na naczyniach pochodzą z kilku ostatnich lat przed wybuchem Wezuwiusza, to nie wolno ulegać pokusie fotograficznego odwzorowania stosunków społecznych w konkretnym punkcie czasowym. Pojedyncze inskrypcje datowane na kilkadziesiąt lat poprzedzających wybuch wulkanu, zachęcają do ostrożności.

Przykład Pompejów pokazuje, że działalność kobiet w biznesie, nie była kaprysem pojedynczych jednostek. Oczywiście świat gospodarki był z pewnością zmajoryzowany przez mężczyzn, ale kobiety stanowiły w nim istotny odsetek. Samodzielność ekonomiczna kobiet, ugruntowana u zarania pryncypatu ustawodawstwem Augusta, była w I w n.e. faktem, a jednocześnie częścią szerszych procesów przeobrażeń rzymskiej rodziny i społeczeństwa.